UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/772,476	02/05/2004	Michael K. Brown	13210-140	4975	
	7590 10/28/200 ND PARR LLP/S.E.N. .	EXAMINER			
40 KING STREET WEST BOX 401 TORONTO, ON M5H 3Y2			LAI, MICHAEL C		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CANADA		2457			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/28/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/772,476	BROWN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MICHAEL C. LAI	2457		

	WIGHAEL C. LAI	2437	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION I	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	r).		
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter			
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi			
	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	- ·		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	v);		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all- non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 1,7-14,23,29-36,45 and 46.		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/YVES DALENCOURT Primary Examiner, Art U		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner would like to remind that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the references to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Kasai teaches his invention in five embodiments, each embodiment has its own set of drawings and implementations, ranging from the homepage translation system to the mail translation system. Although the Examiner based many of the obviousness references upon a single reference, namely Kasai, the Examiner also based many of the obviousness references upon multiple embodiments (mainly the first and the fourth embodiments) of the reference, not just a single embodiment. In this case, it is known to a person skilled in the art that emails can be sent in several formats including HTML. And because of the high versatility of HTML, a person skilled in the art would certainly consider this language to solve the problem of translation of emails using different formats in Kasai's fourth embodiment. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to convert from a text format into HTML before sending the message to the processing server as a choice of options, thereby solving the problem of translation of emails using different formats.

Furthermore, Applicant argues in page 3 that it would now be possible for mobile computer devices to utilize publicly available HTML translation servers. However, claim 1 does not show the processing server actually processes or translates the HTML message. The examiner maintains his final rejection.